ABSTRACT
            This study examined factors affecting academic achievement
of at-risk minority students to evaluate intervention strategies designed to
assist such students. Data were obtained on 2,386 first-time college students
entering Prince George's Community College (Maryland) in fall 1990. Factor
analysis identified 10 variables that explained a significant proportion of
the achievement variances among students; these included: academic
commitment, persistence, early term survival and progress, academic standing,
financial and academic support, course load carried, college preparedness,
need for remediation, job-related attendance motives, and desire for a
bachelor's degree. Cluster analysis then identified 10 student profiles,
three of which were particularly relevant to minority student achievement: a
"true grit" group, comprising nearly 10 percent of the students, which
overcame basic skills deficiencies and below-par high school backgrounds to
attain above-average achievement levels; "full-time strugglers," the
least-advantaged, lowest socioeconomic status, poorest high school background
group, one-fourth of whom managed to achieve with institutional assistance;
and "unprepareds," similar to the full-time strugglers in socioeconomic
background, but with less than 1 percent classifying as achievers. Based on
these findings, in the fall of 1997 the college launched, a pilot program for
48 students needing remedial instruction in math and English. (Contains 17
references and 3 tables.) (MDM)

# Can College Actions Improve the Academic Achievement of At-risk Minority Students?

Craig A. Clagett
Vice President for Planning, Marketing, and Assessment
Carroll Community College
Westminster, Maryland 21157

A multi-stage research design, employing factor, regression, and cluster analyses, identified profiles of successful and unsuccessful at-risk minority students at a large, suburban, predominantly African-American community college. Successful students were characterized by personal commitment and motivation, financial aid, participation in academic support services, completion of developmental requirements, and consecutive attendance in their first three major terms. A new program incorporating these findings was launched in fall 1997.

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

2

1

# Can College Actions Improve the Academic Achievement of At-risk Minority Students?

Numerous studies confirm that African-American and Hispanic-American students have lower college retention and graduation rates than white students. However, further research is needed (1) investigating the factors that account for these low success rates and (2) evaluating the effectiveness of interventions designed to improve minority student achievement. The Institute for Research on Adults in Higher Education (IRAHE), located at the University of Maryland University College, through its Diverse Students Program (DSP), has pursued these twin research goals (IRAHE, 1997). Their research to date suggests that

> it is not race *per se* that accounts for lower or higher success in learning, but other social, economic, and background educational conditions that impact some ethnic minority groups disproportionately. In other words, though we confirm that some ethnic minorities have lower success rates than Caucasians on some success measures, our data analyses show that it is not race or ethnicity that causes these discrepancies, but sets of other factors-in-combination that have comparable effects, whatever the ethnic group to which the individuals belong.

The IRAHE researchers posited that factors other than demographics, such as student attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, and life situations, were important determinants of academic risk or promise.

> [O]ur research has identified quite different profiles within ethnic groups between the low achiever and high achiever students. Analysis of the data yields unusually high correlations between one profile and low success rates and even higher correlations between a second profile and high success rates, regardless of the ethnicity of the individuals.

Research conducted at Prince George's Community College, an IRAHE participating institution, extended this approach through a multi-stage study design using factor and cluster analyses to identify ten student profiles based on student academic intentions, preparedness, attendance patterns, course performance, and institutional support. Each profile was further analyzed in terms of academic progress and achievement, socio-demographic background, and component factors to yield a comprehensive picture of who succeeds and who fails at this large, suburban, majority African-American open-admissions college. These findings were used to develop intervention programs targeting the most at-risk groups.

## DEFINITION OF ACHIEVEMENT

Achievement was defined as the percentage of degree-seeking students graduating, transferring, or reaching sophomore status in good standing five years after initial enrollment at PGCC. The study population was 2,386 first-time college students entering the college in fall 1990.

## FACTOR ANALYSIS

Preliminary, exploratory multivariate analyses indicated extensive multicollinearity among the 90 variables available on college databases for model inclusion. Factor analysis was employed, resulting in the identification of ten factor scales. They are summarized in the Table 1, along with the proportion of variance in the achievement variable explained by each factor's direct and indirect effects (semi-partials were also calculated to assess each factor's direct effect) produced by a regression of all ten factors plus seven background variables ($R^2$=.469).

| Table 1. Factor Scale Interpretation and Achievement Variance Explained | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Factor Label | Interpretation | Defining Variables | $r^2$ |
| COMMIT | Committed to studies | Attended both day/evening<br>Attended both on/off campus<br>Enrolled last term of study<br>Attended summer session(s)<br>Changed program major | .24 |
| PERSIST | Attendance persistence/ continuity | Enrolled last term of study<br>Number of major terms attended<br>Continuous enrollment (no stop out) | .21 |
| LAUNCH | Early term survival and progress | Enrolled first three major terms<br>Good academic standing first year | .20 |
| PERFORM | Course performance/ academic standing | Cumulative grade point average<br>Earned/attempted credit ratio<br>Proportion terms in good standing | .16 |
| SUPPORT | Financial and academic support | Pell Grants received<br>Minority Retention Prog/SSS participation<br>Career planning/study skills courses | .12 |
| LOAD | Course load carried | Mean major term course hour load<br>Credit hour load in first term | .10 |
| PREPARED | College preparedness/ completion of remediation | Developmental program completed<br>Math placement test score<br>Mean placement test score | .10 |
| REMEDIAL | Need for basic skills remediation and stalled academic progress | Number of basic skill deficiencies<br>Developmental courses in first year<br>Number of developmental courses repeated<br>Restricted academic status/probation<br>No credit courses attempted | .10 |
| JOBMOTV | Job-related attendance motives | Job/personal enrichment enrollment reason<br>Occupational curricula | .03 |
| TRANSEEK | Seeking bachelor's degree | Transfer curricula | .01 |

## REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Several additional regressions were run to assess the contributions of various combinations of factor scales and background variables to explaining student achievement (see Table 2). Tinto's assertion that academic and social integration are key to understanding student persistence has found support in most studies at four-year institutions. However, a growing body of literature suggests that social integration is *not* associated with persistence at two-year colleges. Pascarella and Chapman (1983), Fox (1986), Nora, Attinasi, and Matonak (1989), and Halpin (1990) found academic integration a significant influence on community college student persistence, but social integration either not associated or negatively associated with persistence. In their study at a public research university, Eimers and Pike (1997) found the importance of academic integration particularly acute for minority students. The present study found support for the academic integration hypothesis, confirmed the findings of previous studies that socio-demographic background variables are not important correlates of achievement, and posited the existence of an important *personal motivation* component of academic achievement. This last component was unusual in that it derived from behavioral data rather than survey-based attitudinal scales.

| Table 2. Alternative Regression Models and Achievement Variance Explained | | |
|---|---|---|
| Regression Model | Independent Variables Included | $R^2$ |
| Whole model | All 10 factors plus 7 background variables | .469 |
| Academic integration | LOAD, PERFORM, PERSIST, REMEDIAL | .355 |
| Good start | PREPARED, LAUNCH | .256 |
| Personal motivation | COMMIT, SUPPORT | .249 |
| Socio-demographic | SES, race, gender, age ,marital, entry timing, HS quality | .104 |
| Study orientation | JOBMOTV, TRANSEEK | .034 |

## CLUSTER ANALYSIS

Institutional research, in contrast to educational research, is less interested in developing generalizable theory but rather most concerned with guiding college-specific policies and programs. Theoretical models of student persistence and achievement can account for about half of the variance (Pantages and Creedon, 1978), and individual independent variables typically 14 to 16 percent (Cubeta, 1997). Not only do our best theories fail to account for half of the variance in student progress and achievement, the factors that affect persistence and achievement vary across institutions (Noel, 1978; Valiga, 1980). Thus each college must conduct research on its own students to guide intervention strategies to improve minority student achievement. To target programs to those most in need and most likely to respond to interventions, a campus must accurately *profile* its student body. Cluster analysis is a useful technique for this purpose.

Using scores on the ten factor scales from the factor analysis, the cluster analysis yielded ten student clusters or study profiles (see Table 3). Three clusters were of particular relevance to this study of minority student achievement. The True Grit cluster, comprising nearly 10 percent of the cohort, overcame basic skills deficiencies and below-par high school backgrounds to attain above-average achievement levels--largely through strong motivation (high COMMIT scores). A fourth of the students in the Full-time Strugglers cluster, the least advantaged group (lowest socio-economic status, poorest high school backgrounds, highest mean REMEDIAL factor score) managed to achieve, with institutional assistance (with a mean SUPPORT score twice the cohort average). The Unprepareds, similar to the Full-time Strugglers in socio-demographic background, need for remediation, study goals, curriculum choices, and course loads, had dramatically less success--less than one percent classifying as achievers. The Full-time Strugglers scored substantially higher on four factors: SUPPORT, COMMIT, LAUNCH, and PREPARED--the latter reflecting *completion* of developmental requirements.

| Table 3. Selected Attributes of Student Profile Clusters Row Percentages | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cluster | N | African-Am | SES Index | Skill Deficient | Good Start | Achievers |
| Dean's List | 233 | 26 | 61 | 32 | 77 | 76 |
| Scholars | 158 | 42 | 45 | 40 | 79 | 68 |
| Collegiates | 342 | 25 | 62 | 36 | 73 | 66 |
| True Grit | 236 | 60 | 47 | 67 | 46 | 43 |
| Pragmatists | 106 | 41 | 50 | 54 | 55 | 30 |
| FT Strugglers | 134 | 80 | 34 | 92 | 73 | 25 |
| PT Strugglers | 254 | 49 | 49 | 67 | 54 | 17 |
| Vanishers | 168 | 35 | 55 | 37 | 12 | 11 |
| Unprepareds | 369 | 80 | 42 | 100 | 34 | <1 |
| Casuals | 386 | 52 | 49 | 33 | 10 | <1 |
| Total cohort | 2,386 | 50 | 50 | 56 | 56 | 31 |

INTERVENTION STRATEGIES

What factors differentiated relatively successful from unsuccessful at-risk minority students at PGCC? Personal commitment and motivation, financial aid, participation in academic support services, completion of developmental requirements, and attendance in each of the first three major terms (fall-spring-fall). Largely based on these findings, the college launched the $R^3$ Academy in fall 1997, a pilot program for 48 students needing Developmental Math 003 plus remedial English and/or reading. Based on the learning community concept and incorporating all of the positive factors identified by the research, the Academy will test whether college actions can improve the academic achievement of

its at-risk minority students. By the time of the Forum, the Academy will be nearing the end of its second semester and the college will have early insights into its impact on short-term retention and academic performance. A status report on the Academy will close the formal presentation part of the session.

## SELECTED REFERENCES

Bers, T.H., and Smith, K.E. (1991). Persistence of community college students: The influence of student intent and academic and social integration. *Research in Higher Education* 32: 53--556.

Boughan, K. (1996). Student racial background and cohort 1990 four-year academic outcomes (Report EA96-6). Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, Prince George's Community College.

Boughan, K. (1997). Toward a model of the academic process: Summarizing cohort 1990 progress and achievement (Report EA97-6). Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, Prince George's Community College.

Clagett, C.A. (1995). An outcomes typology for community colleges. *Assessment Update* 7(4): 10-11.

Cubeta, J.F. (1997). The effects of social and personality variables on academic success and persistence. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Eimers, M.T., and Pike, G.R. (1997). Minority and nonminority adjustment to college: Differences or similarities? *Research in Higher Education* 38: 77-97.

Feldman, M.J. (1993). Factors associated with one-year retention in a community college. *Research in Higher Education* 34: 503-512.

Fox, R.N. (1986). Application of a conceptual model of college withdrawal to disadvantaged students. *American Educational Research Journal* 23: 415-423.

Gosman, E.J., Dandridge, B.A., Nettles, M.T., and Thoeny, A.R. (1983). Predicting student progression: The influence of race and other student and institutional characteristics on college student performance. *Research in Higher Education* 18: 209-236.

Halpin, R.L. (1990). An application of the Tinto model to the analysis of freshman persistence in a community college. *Community College Review* 17(4): 22-32.

Institute for Research on Adults in Higher Education. (1997). The outcomes of diversity in higher education: Factors affecting ethnic minority successes and comparative effectiveness of selected interventions. Grant proposal, University of Maryland University College.

Noel, L., ed. (1978). *Reducing the Dropout Rate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Nora, A., Cabrera, A., Hagedorn, L.S., and Pascarella, E. (1996). Differential impacts of academic and social experiences on college-related behavioral outcomes across different ethnic and gender groups at four-year institutions. *Research in Higher Education* 37: 427-451.

Pascarella, E., and Chapman, D.W. (1983). A multiinstitutional, path analytic validation of Tinto's model of college withdrawal. *American Educational Research Journal* 20: 87-102.

Valiga, M.J. (1980). Institutional variability in the causes of college attrition. Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Atlanta.

Voorhees, R. (1987). Toward building models of community college persistence: A logit analysis. *Research in Higher Education* 26: 115-129.

Webb, M. (1989). A theoretical model of community college student degree persistence. *Community College Review* 16(4): 42-49.

8

# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Can College Actions Improve the Academic Achievement of At-risk Minority Students?

Author(s): Craig A. Clagett

| Corporate Source: | Publication Date: May 1998 |
|---|---|

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

| The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents | The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents | The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents |
|---|---|---|
| PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ Sample _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) | PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ Sample _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) | PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ Sample _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) |
| Level 1 [✓] | Level 2A [ ] | Level 2B [ ] |
| Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy. | Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only | Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only |

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

Sign here,→ please

| Signature: [signature] | Printed Name/Position/Title: Craig A. Clagett — Vice President for Planning, Marketing and Assessment |
|---|---|
| Organization/Address: Carroll Community College 1601 Washington Road | Telephone: | FAX: |
| | E-Mail Address: | Date: 3/15/99 |

Westminster MD 21157          cclagett@carroll.cc.md.us          (over)

# III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

| Publisher/Distributor: |
| --- |
| Address: |
| Price: |

# IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

| Name: |
| --- |
| Address: |

# V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON HIGHER EDUCATION
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
ONE DUPONT CIRCLE, SUITE 630
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-1183

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com